CLEAN AIR ACT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Meeting of the Subcommittee on Linking Land Use, Transportation, and Air Quality
Thursday, October 1, 1998
The International Trade Center
The Ronald Reagan Building
1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Gay MacGregor, EPA-OMS, and Bob Wyman, Latham and Watkins, called the meeting to order at 5:15 p.m. After the attendees introduced themselves, the minutes from the previous meeting were brought up for comments and were formally accepted by the subcommittee. A recent memo from Paul Rasmussen, EPA, summarizing the teleconference discussion on CAAAC award proposals was also brought up briefly, but discussion was deferred to the end of the meeting.

Report from the Quantification Workgroup (Steve Gerritson)

Steve Gerritson began his report by summarizing the Quantification Workgroup's conference call minutes. The Workgroup is attempting to assist in the development of innovative methods for quantifying emission reductions from alternative or experimental methods of compliance. The Workgroup's two main areas of work involve reviewing existing documents and looking at ongoing research. Mr. Gerritson suggested that the subcommittee could assist in analyzing current research. He also noted that the Workgroup is looking for more members.

Questions and Comments

- Ms. MacGregor commented that she is aware of a large amount of interest from different organizations that would like to test their ideas for voluntary programs but have no way to quantify the air quality benefits. She added that in the past year EPA has hired contractors to develop methodologies for quantification, and that work products from these contractors would be sent to the subcommittee for review. Ms. MacGregor also urged subcommittee members to consider becoming involved if they have an interest.

- Mr. Gerritson commented that the Workgroup is linked to both this subcommittee and the Economic Incentives subcommittee, and asked whether the meetings of these two

are interested in these quantification methodologies. Ms. Terry also added that she may have some helpful in-house information to share with the subcommittee.

Overview of the TEA-21 Legislation (Camille Mittelholtz, U.S. DOT)

Camille Mittelholtz, U.S. DOT, began the presentation by noting that TEA-21 is a very large bill (like the Clean Air Act) and has more money for transit than has ever been offered in a federal re-authorization for surface transportation programs. She also noted that TEA-21 continues ISTEA's emphasis on allowing communities the flexibility to choose between programs and breaks down some of the barriers that have hindered past funding programs (e.g., funding for transit can be received from a variety of programs in addition to the actual transit funding programs in the bill).

Ms. Mittelholtz next provided a brief overview of the federal funding process. She explained that the purpose of the federal funding programs is to give assistance to state transportation agencies and to transit agencies. These agencies, in turn, must develop a planning process -- including metropolitan and statewide transportation plans -- to demonstrate how the funding will be used. Metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) and states must develop long-range transportation plans and shorter-range transportation improvement programs (TIPs), both of which must conform to the state implementation plan (SIP). Funding is largely allocated through state and local choice, although there are formula programs and earmarked funds specified in TEA-21 (as was also the case under ISTEA). Ms. Mittelholtz noted that states do not prefer to have projects funded with earmarked funds, as this tends to disrupt the local planning process.

Ms. Mittelholtz then provided a brief overview of some of TEA-21's key environmental programs:

- The Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Improvement Program has been continued at a higher level than previously under ISTEA, with a few changes to ensure that maintenance areas are clearly eligible to receive money. There is also a provision for funding for projects that are in newly designated non-attainment areas. As under ISTEA, there are broad eligibility criteria for

- Transit Enhancements is a new program that will provide money for historic preservation and amenities connected with transit services and improvements.

- Funding continues to be available for bicycle and pedestrian walkways through a variety of programs, particularly CMAQ and TE.

- The Recreational Trails Program is continued under TEA-21. This is a formula program that is funded by sources such as non-road gas taxes. Under this program, a state committee selects which improvements are funded, with a share of funds going to both non-motorized trails and motorized trails.

- The National Scenic Byways Program is continued under TEA-21. This program sets aside roadways with historic or scenic significance, and allows states to conduct planning programs and education programs for these roadways. (TE funds also can be used to finance byways as well.)

At this point in her presentation, Ms. Mittelholtz discussed a few key issues concerning the metropolitan planning process. She indicated that, under TEA-21, DOT has identified a very streamlined list of factors that need to be considered in the planning process, including the environment. She also indicated that TEA-21 will ensure that there continue to be opportunities for public input in the planning process. Ms. Mittelholtz informed the subcommittee that, in response to concerns over the length of the project review process under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), DOT has been directed to find ways to streamline the environmental review process for both highway and transit projects. As such, DOT will be working with partner agencies to develop a schedule for reviewing projects more quickly. DOT will also be looking at ways to better integrate the transportation planning process with the environmental review process in project development.

Ms. Mittelholtz continued her presentation with a discussion of the Transportation and Community and System Preservation Pilot Program (TCSP). She indicated that funds totaling

populations and geographic regions, and (4) coordination with statewide and MPO transportation planning processes.

Ms. Mittelholtz then informed the subcommittee that DOT is hoping to set aside research funds to look at the relationships between transportation, land use, and air quality, and also to improve planning tools and existing transportation models. She noted that DOT is emphasizing the importance of involving private sector developers in the transportation planning process. Ms. Mittelholtz also indicated that DOT is attempting to focus its community preservation practices on high growth areas, urban growth areas, green corridors, compact development, and infill development.

Regarding the administration of TCSP funds, Ms. Mittelholtz explained that DOT has issued a *Federal Register* notice asking for letters of intent from parties that are interested in obtaining TCSP funding. These short letters will need to demonstrate how communities think their projects can address the criteria listed in the notice. The letters must be sent to the state FHWA office, where they will go through a selection process for determining a workable number of TCSP projects.

Ms. Mittelholtz next discussed some of the key questions regarding TCSP (outlined in the *Federal Register* notice) that DOT would like addressed. She noted that one the biggest issues for DOT is how to support innovative projects and develop new planning techniques while continuing to rely on the MPO planning process. She indicated that these innovative projects would be ones not currently included in an MPO plan and that would need to be added to the planning processes as time goes on. Ms. Mittelholtz also indicated that DOT is looking for input on how innovative projects can be evaluated and on how DOT can ensure that selected projects actually provide a lasting example of benefits. She welcomed the subcommittee's input and comments on the questions outlined in the *Federal Register* notice and informed the subcommittee that DOT is currently developing a TCSP web site.

The final topic Ms. Mittelholtz discussed in her presentation was "value pricing," which she indicated is a continuation of congestion pricing. She explained that TEA-21 provides funding (for both planning and implementation for at least the first three years of the project) for value pricing demonstration projects. Ms. Audette added that EPA and DOT have convened a workgroup that is working on a value pricing pilot program that will include up to 15 programs. She indicated that eligible projects could include toll roads and parking pricing/commuter choice

environmental review processes and how certain projects should be recognized as being presumptively beneficial to the environment. He stressed that the same issue needs to be addressed with regard to the NEPA process. In particular, Mr. Wyman asserted that there needs to be a way to make a presumptive finding such that if air quality agencies decide that a project is beneficial from an air quality standpoint, then air quality issues do not need to be examined in the environmental review process. He posited that a less laborious review process would be more encouraging to states and localities who are considering undertaking such projects. Ms. Mittelholtz agreed, adding that improvements to the conformity process could reduce some of the repetitiveness of the environmental review process.

- Mr. Wyman commented on the requirement that research and planning efforts need to be put in an MPO plan before they can be funded. In particular, he expressed concern that certain efforts may never be undertaken because there is no way of predicting in advance that an MPO would put them in a plan. Ms. Mittelholtz responded that DOT would like to have implementation projects and planning projects (which typically encompass a great deal of innovative ideas) added to a TIP before actual funding occurs in order to ensure that they are endorsed by an MPO. She also indicated that DOT expects to make decisions centrally on what research projects it will be undertaking. Mr. Wyman suggested that if DOT wants to encourage innovation, it might need to find a way to demonstrate to MPOs that certain types of research and planning projects should be put in the TIP. Otherwise, some innovative ideas may never be proposed and approved for DOT funding.

- Bill Goldsmith, Cornell University, commented that when MPOs are developing TIPs, they typically have more ideas than states will approve. He further commented that there often seems to be tension between people who have innovative, environmentally friendly ideas and people who do not, and asked whether the purpose of TCSP is actually to stimulate people to go beyond what they could do using the relatively limited funding for TCSP. Ms. Mittelholtz responded that this is one of the reasons why DOT is emphasizing the evaluation component of the process (i.e., to make innovative projects more routine and more easily evaluated). Ms. Mittelholtz also noted that DOT is trying to better understand the relationships between land use and transportation.

- Bill Auberle, Northern Arizona University, asked whether the letters of intent requested in

- Mr. Wyman asked about the added provisions under TEA-21 that allow funding for public/private partnerships. In particular, he was concerned whether private participants in these partnerships could receive funding under TCSP. Ms. Bullard responded that public/private partnerships are being encouraged but that the issue is really over who can actually receive the funding. She indicated that private participants probably will not be considered for grants unless they have established these partnerships in their proposals.

- Michael Mittelholzer, NAHB, asked when DOT will be making decisions on research areas. Ms. Mittelholtz responded that, although DOT will be making central decisions on research, the *Federal Register* notice also invites ideas about which areas should be researched. Mr. Mittelholzer stated that NAHB is interested in discussing the research areas and, in particular, the interplay between transportation and land use. He stressed that non-governmental parties could add valuable ideas in this area. Mr. Mittelholzer also asked if TCSP would be on the agenda at the Environmental and Planning Outreach Session that will be held in Providence, Rhode Island, in November and, if not, whether it could be added to the agenda. Ms. Bullard responded that TCSP was the principal focus of "Railvolution," and that the focus of the current outreach sessions will be environmental streamlining and other environmental issues. Ms. Mittelholtz added that DOT would welcome any comments from NAHB.

- Mr. Wyman asked about public/private partnerships under the CMAQ program. Ms. Mittelholtz responded that some initial guidance on CMAQ has been issued and is available from the FHWA division offices. She also noted that DOT is looking to spend time on making the public/private partnership issue work effectively and as intended by Congress. Ms. MacGregor added that Mark Simons from EPA-OMS has been working with Mike Sibonis from DOT on the CMAQ guidance and that the draft guidance is close to being distributed. (Ms. Audette indicated the target date for the draft guidance is November 18.) Ms. MacGregor also suggested that the draft CMAQ guidance could be addressed at the next meeting or through a subcommittee conference call.

Portland LUTRAQ Case Study (Greg Green, Oregon DEQ)

Greg Green, Oregon DEQ, began his presentation by explaining that Portland's Land Use, Transportation, and Air Quality (LUTRAQ) initiative was originally developed as an alternative to

in Portland's Urban Growth Boundary (particularly in Washington County) that eventually led to an overly congested freeway system. In order to alleviate the problem, a freeway system known as the "Western Bypass" was proposed. During the environmental impact statement process for the Western Bypass, a group called 1000 Friends of Oregon proposed LUTRAQ as an alternative, the purposes of which were (1) to challenge the automobile-based transportation system and (2) to promote development patterns that would reduce land consumption, vehicle trips, and air pollution.

Mr. Green informed the subcommittee that when 1000 Friends of Oregon proposed the LUTRAQ project, they went on the assumption that proper metropolitan planning had to begin with the integration of three key transportation elements: development and land use policy, transportation investments, and market strategies. They established the idea of "transit-oriented development" (TOD) and proposed mixed use centers, urban TODs, and neighborhood TODs. The transportation investments in the LUTRAQ process consisted of light rail, express bus services, local feeder bus services, demand-responsive transit, bicycle and pedestrian improvements, and more efficient roadway improvements. The market strategies developed to support LUTRAQ involved a daily parking charge for SOV vehicles traveling in the LUTRAQ study area, the proceeds of which would be used to provide free transit passes (with the ultimate goal being to make transit absolutely free in the Portland region).

Mr. Green next described the planning that went into the implementation of LUTRAQ. He explained how this planning was accomplished by incorporating the LUTRAQ concepts into the "Metro 2040 Plan," which was used to determine what the Portland region would look like in the year 2040. As part of this process, local governments established design guidelines and standards in order to encourage certain types of development. Among the areas of focus in this process were transit stops, street configuration, pedestrian connections, commercial configurations, building entries, building setbacks, mixed housing, minimum densities, on-street and off-street parking, parking configuration, integrated uses, and auto-oriented uses.

Mr. Green concluded his presentation by presenting mode choice, congestion, and air quality results from LUTRAQ and other alternatives that were considered. He noted that Portland has been able to take credit for the benefits from LUTRAQ in its ozone and carbon monoxide maintenance plans. The LUTRAQ data show the following successes:

- 22.5% fewer work trips made in SOV vehicles

Questions and Comments

- Iwan Choronenko, EPC-Hillsborough County, Florida, commented that LUTRAQ was a very impressive undertaking. He also asked about political ramifications from the project (e.g., from sequestering land), as well as what types of resistance were encountered and how long it took to accomplish the objectives of the project. Mr. Green responded that there was no need to sequester land for LUTRAQ because there were about 22,000 acres of land available at the start of the project. He noted that there have been some political consequences, but in general the project has been very well supported throughout the region.

- Mr. Goldsmith asked how the LUTRAQ process has shifted the expenditure of federal transportation funds altogether and whether it has really changed the way funds are spent in the Portland region. Ms. Mittelholtz responded that the basic decision on LUTRAQ was made on the basis of modeling, which indicated that pursuing transit improvements could succeed in reducing vehicle trips and emissions and could prove to be more beneficial than building a freeway system. Mr. Green added that, although he was not sure whether LUTRAQ has enabled the Portland region to gain access to more federal highway funds, the project has affected how these funds are dispersed throughout the region. Ms. Bullard commented that an indirect result of LUTRAQ has been the establishment of new programs (such as TCSP), and that LUTRAQ serves as a model for demonstrating how a project in one area can work just as well in other areas.

- Mr. Mittelholzer asked whether the emission benefits presented by Mr. Green are based on projected growth, and asked what the emission benefits are from the communities that are already developed in the region. Mr. Green responded that the LUTRAQ benefits included in the Portland area's maintenance plan are based on projected future growth, and that the benefits from existing communities are very small.

- William Donohue, Sun Company, asked about the kinds of zoning changes that were necessary to effectuate LUTRAQ. Mr. Green responded that most of the changes involved lot sizes (e.g., for parking areas). He also noted that in some cases changes in existing residential zoning were made, and that the effect of these changes was an increase in density.

- Linda Rimer, EPA, asked how Portland will deal with the issue of affordable housing. Mr. Green responded that one of the criteria for grading projects submitted for funding approval is the extent to which they provide low-income housing.

- Mr. Goldsmith asked how much metropolitan growth has occurred across the river from Portland, in the state of Washington. Mr. Green responded that, through the year 2040, population in the Portland region is expected to grow by roughly 760,000 and VMT is projected to grow by about 5 million miles per day. He indicated that Vancouver, Washington, is actually growing faster than Portland is right now. Mr. Collett then asked about the current population of the Portland region. Mr. Green responded that the current population is in the Portland region is about 1.4 million. He also noted that the population of Vancouver (which is included in Portland's airshed) is around 500,000.

Presentation on the Atlantic Steel Project in Atlanta (Tim Torma, EPA)

Ms. Audette opened the discussion by reviewing the previous meeting's presentation on the Air Brownfield Pilot Program that EPA has started in conjunction with the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the Department of Commerce, and a number of different EPA agencies. The program partners currently are looking at selected brownfield sites, analyzing proposed development or development that has already taken place to see what has occurred because of that development, and verifying whether there are any air quality benefits. Ms. Audette indicated that the pilot is taking place primarily in Baltimore, Chicago, and Dallas, although Atlanta has recently been added to the program. She then introduced the Atlantic Steel Brownfield Redevelopment project and briefly discussed several maps of the Atlanta area and the site location.

Tim Torma, EPA, began the presentation on the Atlantic Steel Project by providing the subcommittee with a brief overview of Project XL. He indicated that, in the current regulatory system, there are many situations where there are solutions to environmental problems that cannot be used or implemented because EPA's regulations, policies, and permit requirements might preclude them. He also noted that, although our system of environmental protection has led to a number of improvements over the last 26 years, there are an increasing number of problems that cannot be adequately addressed by existing statutes, rules, policies, or regulations. Project XL is a potential solution to these problems, and issues a challenge to the regulated community to propose actions/activities that will achieve environmental performance that is superior to that

Mr. Torma next outlined the eight criteria that are required for XL pilot projects. The eight criteria are (1) better environmental results; (2) cost savings or paperwork reduction; (3) stakeholder support; (4) innovation/multi-media pollution prevention; (5) transferability; (6) feasibility; (7) monitoring, reporting, and evaluation; and (8) shifting of risk burden. He explained that there is a very thorough, agency-wide review process for every XL proposal, and that all of the affected EPA program offices must review proposals before they can be accepted.

After providing an overview of Project XL, Mr. Torma next made a few general comments about air quality in the Atlanta region. Atlanta has a serious ozone problem and a sprawl problem. Also, Atlantans drive approximately 100 million miles per day (which is among the highest per capita amounts in the nation), and more than half of Atlanta's ozone-forming pollutants come from vehicular emissions. Mr. Torma also indicated that Atlanta is currently out of compliance with federal transportation conformity requirements (i.e., is in a conformity lapse) and, in accordance with the law, restrictions have been placed on new transportation infrastructure in Atlanta. There are, however, three exceptions to these restrictions: exempt status, grandfathering, and transportation control measures (TCMs).

Mr. Torma then discussed the Atlantic Steel Project. He indicated that the site has been an industrial site for over 100 years and is a 138-acre brownfield near Atlanta's central business district. Jacoby Development Corp. is sponsoring the XL proposal to redevelop the site. The 12 million square-foot redevelopment will be mixed-use (with commercial, residential, office, and entertainment space) and pedestrian-friendly, and will feature a bridge across the I-75/I-85 highway that will link the site with a MARTA transit station.

Mr. Torma next explained why the Atlantic Steel Project is being proposed as an XL candidate. He indicated that the bridge proposed for the site cannot be built during Atlanta's conformity lapse unless the bridge falls under one of the three exceptions listed earlier. Consequently, the project sponsor has asked that the entire redevelopment project be deemed by EPA as a TCM. Mr. Torma indicated that, in considering this request, EPA is assuming that growth is coming to the Atlanta region regardless of whether the Atlantic Steel Project is undertaken. As a result, EPA is now asking whether redevelopment of the site could result in "smart growth" and fewer emissions, rather than increased sprawl.

Mr. Torma then presented a list of the potential environmental benefits from the Atlantic

- Mr. Collett asked whether Atlanta will be making an effort to waive some of the regulations that the developer of the Atlantic Steel site would otherwise be required to satisfy given the existing contamination at the site. Mr. Torma responded that regulations would not be waived, but noted that EPA considers the accelerated brownfield cleanup that would result from the project as "superior environmental performance." He also noted that the current owner of the site (Atlantic Steel), rather than the new owner, will be in charge of cleaning up the site. Mr. Collett also asked how the city is playing a role here as far as providing incentives for the builder (e.g., reduced codes and building restrictions). Mr. Torma responded that the builder had already gone through the zoning process before presenting the project to EPA for XL review.

- Mr. Choronenko asked whether the project was a multi-media project or whether it was concerned with air quality only. He also asked what the emission reductions from the project are likely to be, noting that in an area with an air quality problem like Atlanta's, one project is not likely to make much of a difference. Mr. Torma responded that the project is a multi-media project, although its main focus is on air. He noted that if the proposal does not show future air emission benefits relative to greenfield development, the proposal will not be approved. However, before the project would be rejected, the project sponsor would be given the opportunity to demonstrate other environmental benefits (e.g., less stormwater run-off) that could result from the project. Mr. Torma also agreed with Mr. Choronenko that the overall air quality benefits from the project are not likely to be significant, but he reminded the subcommittee that the intent of Project XL is to promote projects that make sense, regardless of the size of their net benefits.

- Mr. Mittelholzer asked what threshold is being used to determine whether the project has a net environmental benefit relative to other development approaches (e.g., building 39 single-family homes in three lots with bike paths connecting the lots). He commented that the key issue is the criteria that define "superior environmental performance."

- Mr. Wyman asked how EPA ensures that XL projects involve all the right stakeholders. Mr. Torma indicated that it is the project sponsor's responsibility to identify all relevant stakeholders. He also noted that EPA is trying to develop a technical assistance grant that could be used to help sponsors identify stakeholders. Mr. Wyman also asked about what EPA does when a stakeholder objects to a project that appears to be a "good" project. Mr. Torma responded that it depends on the seriousness of the claims against the project.

noted that organizations proposing XL projects must demonstrate to EPA that they have the financial and technical capabilities to carry out their projects.

- Mr. Mittelholzer asked whether the Atlantic Steel Project can be interpreted as just a demonstration of how to use the nuances of the conformity rules to allow a project to be approved. Ms. MacGregor responded that EPA is trying to experiment with its regulations in order to find ways that it can meet multiple environmental goals. Mr. Mittelholzer also asked what criteria EPA will be using to determine whether one type of development project is better than another. He noted that different types of development often can demonstrate superior environmental performance in different ways (e.g., improved air quality, reduced water pollution). Ms. MacGregor explained that EPA is in the process of creating a number of evaluation tools and will be using these tools to make balanced comparisons between projects. Mr. Torma added that the methodology used under Project XL will be posted on the web site in the near future.

- Mr. Choronenko asked whether EPA is considering input from MPOs and other regulatory agencies when reviewing XL proposals. He commented that not all agencies may agree that a certain project is a good idea, and suggested that EPA may first want to test Project XL as a prototype or a pilot. Ms. MacGregor responded that EPA is currently looking at Project XL as an experimental pilot.

Presentation on the Location Efficient Mortgage Chicago Pilot Project (Jacky Grimshaw, Center for Neighborhood Technology)

Jacky Grimshaw, Center for Neighborhood Technology, began her presentation by noting that the Location Efficient Mortgage (LEM) is an experimental idea. She explained that the location efficiency is a nexus point for livable, sustainable communities and customer-oriented public transportation, and stresses "accessibility" rather than "mobility." She also noted that the location efficiency concept attempts to solve the problems of (1) measuring the economic advantages of urban home ownership and (2) monetizing this economic advantage in the mortgage writing process.

Ms. Grimshaw next provided background information on the LEM program. The partners involved in the program are the Center for Neighborhood Technology, the Natural Resources

Ms. Grimshaw next discussed the concept of "Location Efficiency Value" (LEV), which is a place-based advantage. She explained that the LEM's geographical information system (GIS) model calculates the LEV is two basic steps. First, the model calculates a household's monthly transportation-related savings based on zonal conditions, household size and income, vehicle ownership, and pedestrian friendliness. Then, the model calculates the same household's savings in the least accessible 25 percent of the region. The difference between these two savings estimates represents the LEV.

Ms. Grimshaw informed the subcommittee that Fannie Mae has selected the LEM as one of its home ownership demonstration projects and has agreed to purchase $100 million of mortgages for the LEM. She also explained that Fannie Mae has changed the ratios for underwriting criteria for home mortgages as part of the LEM demonstration. Fannie Mae will also be sponsoring a market test of the LEM in Chicago in 1998 and in Los Angeles and Seattle in 1999.

Ms. Grimshaw next presented examples of the financial benefits from the LEM for an urban homebuyer in the Chicago area. She indicated that an average family that lives in the city, does not own a car, uses rail service to commute, and shops locally could save up to $653 per month compared to a suburban location. If this family owned one car, the savings would fall to $365 per month. In addition to these financial benefits, Ms. Grimshaw explained that the LEM also has the potential to encourage moderate-income families to purchase urban homes, increase public transit ridership, support local services and amenities, and improve local and regional air quality. She indicated that the people most likely to want an LEM include low-to-middle-income households, first-time homebuyers, people desiring to live in urban areas, people who typically use public transportation, and people with predictable travel patterns.

Ms. Grimshaw then summarized some of the key features of an LEM (e.g., the LEV is added to income for purposes of determining qualifying ratios). An LEM is a fully insured, 30-year fixed rate mortgage that can have a loan-to-value ratio of up to 95 percent. LEM borrowers are required to (1) use Fannie Mae-supported home buyer counseling services, (2) purchase an annual, prepaid transit permit, and (3) annually report household information to the LEM program administrators (for research purposes only). The qualifying features for an LEM are based on credit and income history, employment history and stability, ratio calculations, and appraised value of the property.

Ms. Grimshaw concluded her presentation by listing some of the public and private sector applications of the LEM. Public sector applications could include policymaking initiatives, housing and community development programs, credit policies, green insurance, transportation research and planning, and welfare reform. Private sector applications include credit and home ownership counseling, loan and loan insurance marketing, private development and utility planning, and green insurance.

Questions and Comments

- Mr. Auberle expressed his interest in the LEM program and suggested that it would be useful to have Ms. Grimshaw attend a future subcommittee meeting during which she could present the actual results from the Chicago program. Ms. MacGregor suggested that the subcommittee may be able to hold a conference call on the LEM.

- Mr. Collett asked about the time frame for the LEM program in Chicago. Ms. Grimshaw responded that the final details are currently being worked out with Fannie Mae. She indicated that underwriter training will likely take place between November 1998 and February 1999, and that the first loan is likely to be issued in March or April of 1999. Mr. Collett also asked whether the LEM program focuses on existing housing, new housing, or both. He stressed that if the program is applicable to new construction, the program should involve the Greater Chicago Homebuilders' Association. Ms. Grimshaw responded that the program applies to both existing housing and new housing.

Presentation on EPA's Sustainable Urban Environments Task Force (Linda Rimer, EPA)

Ms. Rimer began her presentation by stating that, over the past several decades, EPA and states have succeeded in reducing vehicle emissions by 90 percent from the baseline. She cautioned, however, that mobile source emission levels are expected to start increasing after the turn of the century, due to the fact that recent land use and development practices have made society very dependent on the automobile. She also noted that current development patterns are likely to have significant impacts on water quality and quantity, brownfields, and public health in general.

Ms. Rimer next provided a brief overview of the Sustainable Development Challenge

Ms. Rimer then discussed a recent EPA activity entitled "Sustainable Urban Environments," which is an effort to complement and strengthen existing EPA activities by promoting an integrated, organizational approach for understanding and responding to the impacts that continued urbanization will have on environmental quality and human health. For Sustainable Urban Environments, EPA is looking at a continuum of efforts and is playing a number of roles, including supporting local initiatives, creating incentives, removing barriers, and providing funds, tools, and technical assistance. Ms. Rimer indicated that EPA has already provided funding for the Atlanta modeling project and for the protocols for SIP credits for actions such as land use planning.

Ms. Rimer concluded her presentation by asking for feedback and guidance from the subcommittee. She also noted that EPA is currently developing documentation on Sustainable Urban Environments that the subcommittee could review.

Questions and Comments

- Mr. Wyman asked about which EPA offices are in charge of Sustainable Urban Environments. Ms. Rimer responded that the effort is mainly housed in the Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations, with input from the EPA Regions, the Office of Reinvention, the Office of Policy, and other offices.

- Dan Greenbaum, Health Effects Institute, asked whether EPA is engaging local officials in the Sustainable Urban Environments effort. Ms. Rimer responded that EPA is working with a local government advisory committee and the EPA Regions on conducting urban forums in various cities and regions. Mr. Choronenko suggested that EPA try to get STAPPA/ALAPCO involved in the effort. Ms. Rimer agreed, and added that EPA is also attempting to provide outreach to mayors and is working with the Environmental Council of the States on issues such as land use and growth management.

- Mr. Mittelholzer commented that his organization (NAHB) is interested in the Sustainable Urban Environments effort, and thought it would be useful for EPA to provide a better understanding of all the initiatives that are currently underway.

Conclusion

ATTENDEES

Name	Affiliation	Telephone Number
Stephanie Alston	EPA-OMS	734-214-4952
William Auberle	Northern Arizona University	520-523-5845
Lucie Audette	EPA-OMS	734-214-4850
Matt Borick	ICF Inc.	703-218-2511
Susan Bullard	EPA-OMS	202-260-2614
Iwan Choronenko	EPC-Hillsborough County, Florida	813-272-5530
Chuck Collett	NAHB	319-332-6157
Federico Cura	IWP	703-416-8918
Clem Dinsmore	LEM Partnership	202-244-6648
William Donohue	Sun Company	215-246-8279
Jim Fahey	APWA	202-393-2792
Steve Gerritson		425-486-9784
Bill Goldsmith	Cornell University	607-255-2333
Greg Green	Oregon DEQ	503-229-5397
Dan Greenbaum	Health Effects Institute	617-876-6700
Jacky Grimshaw	Center for Neighborhood Technology	773-278-4800
Shawn Kendall	Phelps Dodge	602-234-8308
Gay MacGregor	EPA-OMS	734-214-4438
Camille Mittelholtz	U.S. DOT	202-366-4861
Michael Mittelholzer	NAHB	800-368-5246
Judy Odoulamy	U.S. DOE	202-586-6399
Stephanie Osborn	APWA	202-393-2792
Paul Rasmussen	EPA	202-260-6877
Linda Rimer	EPA	202-260-4712
Lynn Terry	CARB	916-322-2739
Tim Torma	EPA	202-260-5180
Peter Washburn	EPA	202-260-7852
John White	EPA-OMS	734-214-4353
Jean Wiedenheft	Reinvention Report	703-416-8545
Bob Wyman	Latham and Watkins	213-891-8334